fore had the skeleton of a male specimen prepared, and noted the following points :-

The skull is devoid of ridges, such as are present on the snout iu M. vulgaris and palmuta, and the ethmoidal fontanelle is large; the fronto-squamosal arch is bony and slender; the pterygoids considerahly fail to reach the maxillaries.

The ilium is suspended from the fifteenth vertebra, as in M. vulgaris and palmata, and the caudal vertebræ number 32.

## explanation of the plates.

Plata XXI.
Fig. 1. Rana camerani (p. 550). Upper view.
1a. " Side view of head.
2. Pelodytes eaucasieus ( p .551 ). Upper and lower view.

2 a. ," ." Opeu mouth.
Plate XXII.
Fig. 1. Salamandra caucasica (p. 553). Upper view.

2. Contributions to the Anatomy of Picarian Birds.Part II. ${ }^{1}$ A Note upon the Pterylosis of the Barbets and Toucans. By Frank E. Beddard, M.A., F.R.S., Prosector to the Society.
[Received May 4, 1896.]
In a short article mainly referring to the peculiar "intestiniform" gall-bladder of the Toucans and Barbets, the late Mr. Forbes took occasion to point out other resemblances between these families of birds ${ }^{2}$ to each other and to the Woodpeckers. With regard to the pterylosis, however, Mr. Forbes contented himself with remarking that " Nitzsch, from pterylographical grouuds. ... long ago pointed out this comuectiou." Nitzsch undoubtedly placed in one group Picince, the Barbets, Toucans, and Woodpeckers; but he included with the former in almost inextricable confusion the Bucconidæ, and furthermore observed that "this gronp also has no general pterylographic character, at least none belonging to itself alone." His plate fully bears out this statement to my mind. Nevertheless it seems to me that there are pterylographic likenesses between the Barbets and the Toucans: I find, in fact, that the pterylosis of such Barbets as I have had the opportunity of examining do not agree altogether with Nitzsch's figures. The species that I have studied are Megaloema asiatica, M. hodgsoni, M. javensis, Cyanops franklini, and Xantholoma rosea.

[^0]Of these species the last only (under the name of Bucconides roseicollis) is figured by Nitzsch, and, as I believe, inaccurately.


Featner-tracts of Megalama asiatica.
The right-hand figure shows the ventral aspect, the left-hand figure the dorsal.
The accompanying drawings illustrate the pterylosis of Megalama asiatica. The drawings are copied from the late Prof.Garrod's MS. As will be seen on comparing them with Nitzsch's figures of Megalcema armillaris, there are considerable differences, which of course may possibly exist between allied species. My own observations upon the first four species of my list and those of $\mathrm{Mr}_{\mathrm{r}}$. Forbes (in MS.) upon Megalema virens agree so entirely with each other and with Garrod's sketch that I cannot but think that Nitzsch has fallen into error.

The clief difference between us-it will be observed-concerns the spinal tract. In all the species of Meyalama and Cyanops to which I have referred the posterior part of that tract is, as Nitzsch las correctly indicated, not in comection with the anterior fork; but instead of being a straight band ending at the base of the oil-gland, it forks some little way in front of that gland and surrounds it. Another peculiarity of Meyalema (not figured by Nitzsch in M. armillaris) is a lateral band on either side which commences at the fork of the anterior part of the dorsal tract and runs down to a point about on a level with the middle of the posterior fork. This is quite distinct from the more conspicuous femoral tract, excepting in M. asiatica, where the lateral tract joins the femoral posteriorly. This lateral tract is figured by


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See P. Z. S. 1889, p. 587, for Part I.
    ${ }^{2}$ "Note on the Gall-bladder \&o. of the Toucans and Barbets," P. Z. S. 1882, p. 94.

